

school education classes and a preparation course for Spanish-speaking students to obtain a General Education diploma.

I applaud Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional for 10 years of dedicated service to the Latino community in southern Nevada. Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional is the only organization of its kind in the Silver State, and its work is truly appreciated and admired. I also commend the distinguished leadership of Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional, particularly Ms. Luz Marin Mosquera, Ms. Dora Lopez, and Ms. Kathia Pereira. Under their direction, Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional has assisted more than 45,000 people in southern Nevada with a variety of immigration-related issues. This includes 4,000 people who are now U.S. citizens and 5,300 people who are now DACA beneficiaries.

I wish Hermandad Mexicana Transnacional continued success as the organization continues its meaningful work.

#### UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT NOTIFICATION REQUEST

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my letter to Senator MCCONNELL dated December 17, 2015, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,  
Washington, DC, December 17, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,  
Majority Leader, Russell Senate Office Building,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER MCCONNELL: I request to be notified before any unanimous consent agreement is agreed to regarding the nomination of David Malcolm Robinson to be Assistant Secretary for Conflict and Stabilization Operations and Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization. This request is intended to be made publicly and will be disclosed in the Congressional Record so my name need not be withheld.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GRASSLEY,  
Chairman,  
Committee on the Judiciary.

#### NOMINATION OBJECTION

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am taking this opportunity to notice my objection to the Senate proceeding to the nomination of Janine Anne Davidson of Virginia to be Under Secretary of the Navy. My concern is not with Ms. Davidson's nomination, per se, but with a larger matter concerning the Navy and its policies and practices with regard to retaliation against whistleblowers.

On October 21, 2015, the Washington Post reported that the Navy plans to promote RDML Brian L. Losey, even though the Department of Defense Office of Inspector General, OIG, has found on multiple occasions that he retaliated against perceived whistle-

blowers in response to whistleblower complaints and, in some cases, simply the belief that such complaints had been made. According to the article, the OIG has reported that Rear Admiral Losey went so far as to make a list of suspected whistleblowers and intentionally target them for discipline, demotion, and internal investigation. In several instances, the OIG recommended personnel action be taken against Rear Admiral Losey for these actions. However, the Navy appears poised to ignore those findings and promote Rear Admiral Losey.

On November 13, 2015, I joined with seven other Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, in a request to Jon T. Rymer, the inspector general for the Department of Defense, for the OIG investigation reports related to Rear Admiral Losey's conduct. Those reports were provided to me and to the other Senators signing the November 13 letter just 3 days ago, on December 15, 2015, in redacted form.

Until I have had an opportunity to thoroughly review the inspector general's findings related to Rear Admiral Losey and until I have received assurances from the Navy that it will address those findings specifically and has policies in place to sanction retaliation against whistleblowers more broadly, I will object to the Senate proceeding with the Davidson nomination.

(At the request of Mr. LEE, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, on October 7, 2015, I was unable to vote on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1735, the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016. I ask that the RECORD reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted yes.

Mr. President, on November 10, 2015, I was unable to vote on the motion to concur to the House Amendment to S. 1356, an Act to authorize appropriations for Fiscal Year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense. I ask that the RECORD reflect that, had I been present, I would have voted yes. •

#### ARIZONA STATEHOOD AND ENABLING ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, we wish to speak today about the Arizona Statehood and Enabling Act Amendments of 1999 concerning the investment allocation and distribution of revenues in the State of Arizona's permanent land endowment trust fund. This fund consists of moneys derived from the sale of State trust land that was conveyed to the State of Arizona on admission to the Union in 1912. The State of Arizona was granted approximately 10.9 million acres of land at statehood and today holds in trust over 9 million acres. Every year, revenues generated from trust land uses must be

deposited in the fund and used solely for the benefit of beneficiaries specified in the Constitution of the State of Arizona, predominately Arizona's K-12 public schools.

The Arizona Statehood and Enabling Act Amendments of 1999 repealed strict investment and distribution limitations imposed on the fund by the Congress in the State's enabling act. It also granted the voters of the State of Arizona the authority to adjust distributions to the fund beneficiaries. To accomplish that objective, Congress specifically amended section 28 of the Arizona Enabling Act of 1910 to read, "Distributions from the trust funds shall be made as provided in article 10, Section 7 of the Constitution of the state of Arizona."

The Congressional Budget Office estimate, which was included in the House of Representatives Committee report, indicated that "[e]nactment of this bill would give Arizona state officials greater flexibility in investing and distributing the assets of the state's permanent funds."

My understanding is that this reference to the Constitution of the State of Arizona, in section 28 of the enabling act, authorizes the voters of the State of Arizona to amend their constitution to authorize different distributions than those in place in 1999, including distributions that may pay out more funds to the beneficiaries. I ask the senior Senator from Alaska: Would she agree?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. I want to thank the senior Senator from Arizona for his question. I am familiar with the enabling act's requirements that funds are held in trust for certain beneficiaries, including K-12 public schools, and that distributions are made from Arizona's permanent land endowment trust fund.

The 1910 Arizona Enabling Act specified the level of education-funding distributions that must be made from the State land trust fund. In 1999, Congress amended the 1910 act, eliminating the distribution requirement and providing that such distributions be made as provided for in the Arizona Constitution, specifically article 10, section 7. Thus, as I understand it, so long as changes to the education-funding distributions are accomplished by amendments to article 10, section 7 of the Arizona Constitution, and the funds are used for the beneficiaries of the enabling act, the changes to funding distribution amounts from the State land trust are proper.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank Senator MURKOWSKI for her answer. I have one further question. I believe, should the voters of the State of Arizona change the amounts distributed to the fund beneficiaries by amending article 10, section 7 of the Arizona Constitution, that the consent of Congress is not required prior to the change taking effect. Would the Senator agree?

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Senator MCCAIN, because Congress specified that distributions may be made as determined